

REMARKS

Claims 1-20, 22-26, and 28-35 are pending in the present application.

Claims 21 and 27 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 22, 25, 28, and 29 have been amended.

The specification has been amended to correct various obvious spelling errors. No new matter is added by these amendments.

Amended Claims 1, 2, 7, 22, 25, 28, and 29.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of cancelled claim 27, i.e., to specify that the radiation protection material includes at least one coating on an inner surface thereof to reduce friction of the material with respect to hands. Support for this amendment can be found in original claim 27 and in the specification on page 9, lines 12-23, and on page 10, lines 19-30.

Claim 2 has been amended to remove an unnecessary space between the words "by" and "dry weight" as requested by the Examiner.

Claim 7 has been amended to change its dependency from claim 4 to claim 6. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification on page 4, lines 17-26.

Claim 22 has been amended to change its dependency from cancelled claim 21 to claim 1 and to clarify the antecedent basis for "rubber material" in the original claim. Support for this amendment can be found in original claim 21 and in the specification on page 4, lines 1-5.

Claim 25 has been amended to specify that the pH value of the latex is in the range of about 10 to 11. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification on page 4, lines 11-13.

Claim 28 has been amended to change its dependency from cancelled claim 27 to claim 1. Support for this amendment can be found in the original claims and in the specification on page 9, lines 16-19.

Claim 29 has been amended to change its dependency from cancelled claim 27 to claim 1 and to specify that the surfactant is a cationic surfactant. Support for this amendment is found in original claims and in the specification at page 10, lines 27-30.

No new matter is added by any of these amendments.

Claim Objections.

Claim 2 was objected because of the presence of an extra space between the words "by" and "dry". This informality has been corrected by amendment.

Objections to claims 21 and 27 are moot due to the cancellation of these claims.

Rejections Under 25 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 7, 25, and 29 stand rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C §112, as allegedly being indefinite. Claim 7 was rejected for lack of antecedent basis for the phrase "the water-soluble cellulose ether". Amended claim 7 is dependent on claim 6, which provides the necessary antecedent basis. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 25 was rejected for reciting a pH that is "greater than about 10 to 11", which was deemed indefinite. Amended claim 25 recites a pH in the range of about 10 to 11, which is definite and fully supported by the specification. Thus, this rejection also should be withdrawn.

Claim 29 was rejected for using the relative term "super" in conjunction with the recited cationic surfactant. The Office Action indicates that "super" is not sufficiently defined in the specification. This rejection should be withdrawn, as well, because amended claim 29 omits the term "super", and simply refers to a cationic surfactant, which is a well recognized term of art.

Rejections Under 25 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 1-8, 20, 22-25, and 29-35 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Thiess *et al.* in view of Li *et al.* Cancelled claim 27 was also included in this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of cancelled claim 27. Claims 2-8, 20, 22-25, and 29-35 all depend, either directly or indirectly on claim 1. Accordingly, all of the present claims include the limitations of claim 27, i.e., that the radiation protection material have at

least one layer of a polymer coating on an inner surface thereof that reduces a surface friction of the inner surface of the radiation protection material with respect to the hands. The Office Action notes that the Thiess *et al.* reference does not teach this limitation, but goes on to assert that the Li *et al.* reference does.

According to the Office Action, paragraphs 0014 and 0015 of Li *et al.* teach using at least one layer of a polymer coating on an inner surface that reduces a surface friction of the inner surface of the radiation protection material with respect to hands. This characterization of the teachings of Li *et al.* is incorrect. The Li *et al.* application is directed to *a mold or former* having a release coating on its surface, *not* to a radiation protective material or even a simple rubber material having such a coating on its surface. According to cited paragraph 0015 of Li *et al.*, the invention is "directed to *a mold or former* for the production of natural and synthetic rubber articles, having on *its* surface a release composition comprising a high Tg polymer formed from at least one hydrophobic monomer and at least one hydrophilic monomer." (emphasis added). Li *et al.* do not teach or suggest providing a polymeric coating on the rubber material, itself. Rather, the teachings of Li *et al.* are directed to improved molds for making latex rubber articles, not for reducing the surface friction of a rubber material with respect to the hands. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the improved molds of Li *et al.* with the teachings of Thiess *et al.* to arrive at the presently claimed invention, since the teachings of the two references are unrelated. In order to establish a *prima facie* case for obviousness, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the combined prior art references. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Clearly that burden has not been met here. Accordingly, this ground for rejection cannot stand for any of the rejected claims.

Claims 9, 20 and 26 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Thiess *et al.* in view of Li *et al.* and further in view of Sandbank *et al.* For the same reasons as noted above, this rejection is unwarranted and should be withdrawn. Each of the rejected claims includes the limitation of at least one layer of a polymer coating on an inner surface that reduces a surface friction of the inner surface of the radiation protection material with respect to hands. As

noted above, the combination of Thiess *et al.* in view of Li *et al.* does not disclose this limitation. Combining Sandbank *et al.* with these references does not cure this defect, since Sandbank *et al.* do not teach or suggest the polymer coating limitation, either.

Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Thiess *et al.* in view of Li *et al.* and further in view of Lange *et al.* Lange *et al.* either alone, or in combination with Thiess *et al.* and Li *et al.* do not teach or suggest the polymer coating limitation. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 12-19 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Thiess *et al.* in view of Li *et al.* and further in view of MacLeod *et al.* This rejection should be withdrawn since the combined references do not teach or suggest the polymer coating limitation of the claims.


Similarly, claim 28 was rejected as being unpatentable over Thiess *et al.* in view of Li *et al.* and further in view of Koide *et al.*; claim 1 was rejected as being unpatentable over Sandbank *et al.* in view of Li *et al.*; claims 2-27 and 29-35 were rejected as being unpatentable over Sandbank *et al.* in view of Li *et al.* and further in view of MacLeod *et al.*; and finally claim 28 was rejected as being unpatentable over Sandbank *et al.* in view of Li *et al.* and MacLeod *et al.* and further in view of Koide *et al.* All of these rejections are improper and should be withdrawn, since none of these references, either alone or in any combination teaches or suggests the polymer coating limitation, which is a material limitation of all the present claims.

Conclusion.

Applicants deem all of the present claims to be in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C §112 and to be patentable over the applied prior art. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Feb 16 2005

By 
Arne M. Olson (Reg. No. 30,203)

OLSON & HIERL, LTD.
20 North Wacker Drive
36th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 580-1180

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this **AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER RULE 111** along with the accompanying **Petition and check** are being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage prepaid as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on this 16th day of February, 2005.


Arne M. Olson